

***IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE***

Applicant: Fuminori SATOU  
Title: SOLID OXIDE FUEL CELL WITH IMPROVED GAS  
EXHAUST (As Amended)  
Appl. No.: 10/581,345  
Filing Date: 11/25/2004  
Examiner: Zachary BEST  
Art Unit: 1795  
Confirmation Number: 5020

**STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In accordance to 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, submitted herewith is a record of the substance of the interview on April 29, 2009, between Examiner Zachary Best and Supervisory Examiner Dah-Wei Yuan, regarding the above-captioned application. This statement is being submitted within one (1) month of the date of the Interview Summary and is therefore a timely response.

In accordance with the request in the Interview Summary that the Applicant file a statement of substance of the interview, please be advised that the Interview Summary accurately summarizes the interview.

Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith,

Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date MAY 05 2009

By 

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 295-4011  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Glenn Law  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 34,371

Kevin McHenry  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 62,582

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/581,345	SATOU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Zachary Best	1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Zachary Best.

(3) Kevin McHenry.

(2) Dah-Wei Yuan.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 April 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-7, 11-13, 18 and 19.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hara and Savage.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Amendment was discussed as filed with regard to Figures 1a and 1b. Claimed invention was compared with regard to the Hara and Savage references. Examiner is willing to consider amendment as overcoming the standing art rejections.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Zachary Best/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795